arXiv:1206.1555v2 [math-ph] 24 Jul 2012

$SU(1,1)$ and $SU(2)$ Perelomov number coherent states: algebraic approach for general systems

D. Ojeda-Guillén[a],*
R. D. Mota[b] and V. D. Granados[a]

[a] Escuela Superior de Física y Matemáticas, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Ed. 9, Unidad Profesional Adolfo López Mateos, C.P. 07738 México D. F., Mexico.

[b] Escuela Superior de Ingeniería Mecánica y Eléctrica, Unidad Culhuacán, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Av. Santa Ana No. 1000, Col. San Francisco Culhuacán, Delegación Coyoacán, C.P. 04430, México D. F., Mexico.

Abstract

From the definition of the standard Perelomov coherent states (PCS) we introduce the Perelomov number coherent states (PNCS) of the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra for any realization of its generators. The displacement operator allows to apply a similarity transformation to the $su(1,1)$ generators and construct a set of operators which close the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra, being the PNCS the basis for its unitary irreducible representation. We evaluate the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship (SUR) for a position and momentum-like operators (constructed from the Lie algebra generators) in the PNCS and show that it is minimized for the PCS. We obtain the time evolution of the PNCS and the algebra generators, and prove that the SUR gets its minimum at $t = 0$ and for the standard PCS. Also, we obtain analogous results to these for the $SU(2)$ PNCS. We emphasize that our treatment is strictly algebraic and does not depend on the explicit form of the PNCS, even we report these states.

---

* *E-mail address:* dogphysics@gmail.com

PACS: 03.65.-w, 03.65.Fd, 02.20.Sv, 42.50.Ar

1 Introduction

Erwin Schrödinger introduced the coherent states (CS) in quantum mechanics while he was looking for a system which possessed a classical behavior [1]. The coherent states were reintroduced in quantum optics by the works of Glauber [2], Klauder [3] and Sudarshan [4]. These states are related to the Heisenberg-Weyl group. There are three equivalent approaches to obtain the harmonic oscillator coherent states [5]: a) as eigenstates of the annihilation operator (Glauber's approach), b) as the action of the displacement operator on the ground state (Klauder's approach), or c) as the Heisenberg minimum uncertainty states (Schrödinger's approach).

The Klauder's approach for the one-dimensional harmonic oscillator coherent states were generalized by introducing the displacement number states or number coherent states of the harmonic oscillator (NCSHO). Boiteux and Levelut defined these states by applying the Weyl operator to any state $|n\rangle$ of the harmonic oscillator and they called them semicoherent states [6]. After the introduction of the NCSHO, Roy and Singh [7], Satyanarayana [8], and Oliveira, Kim, Night and Bu*ž*ek [9] gave a detailed study of the properties of these states. More recently, Nieto [10] reviewed the properties of the NCSHO and derived the most general form of these states.

However, the Heisenberg-Weyl is not the only group for which we can construct coherent states. In the 70's, the works of A. O. Barut and L. Girardello [11] and Perelomov [12] generalized the concept of coherent states to general systems related to any algebra of a symmetry group. In particular, A. O. Barut and L. Girardello generalized the Glauber's approach of harmonic oscillator coherent states by studying the eigenfunctions of the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra annihilation operator. Perelomov generalized the Klauder's approach to any Lie algebra by defining the coherent states as the vacuum displaced states, where the displacement operator depends on the Lie algebra generators. These approaches remain as current research fields as it is shown in references [13, 14]. In particular, related to the $su(2)$ and $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra several works have been published, and some of them are [15, 16, 17]. The standard Perelomov coherent states have been obtained successfully for many problems, reported in the references [18, 19, 20]. Also, the coherent states have been obtained for the hydrogen atom [21, 22, 23, 24, 25], the

N-dimensional hydrogen atom and harmonic oscillator [26] (related to the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra), the Morse [27, 28, 29] (related to the $su(2)$ Lie algebra) the Pöschl-Teller [30, 31, 32] and the pseudoharmonic oscillator [33] potentials (related to the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra), and for the two-dimensional harmonic oscillator and Landau level states [34, 35, 36, 37].

On the other hand, the Heisenberg uncertainty relationship was generalized by the work of Schrödinger [38] and Robertson [39] for any two observables. Recently these uncertainty relationships were generalized to several observables and several states [40]. With these works, the Schrödinger's approach of the harmonic oscillator coherent states has been generalized too, by constructing states which minimize these generalized uncertainty relationships [41], called intelligent states (IS) [42].

Despite the generalized coherent states have been widely studied, the number coherent states for the harmonic oscillator are the only one studied and there are no works on the number coherent states for general systems. The aim of the present work is to construct and study some of the properties of the Perelomov number coherent states for the Lie algebras $su(1,1)$ and $su(2)$. For any realization of the corresponding generators, we apply an algebraic treatment based on similarity transformations to the Perelomov number coherent states (PNCS) for the $su(1,1)$ and $su(2)$ Lie algebras. Hence, we construct a set of operators which act on the PNCS and show that these operators close the $su(1,1)$ ($su(2)$) Lie algebra, being the PNCS the basis for its unitary irreducible representation. We evaluate the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship for a position and momentum-like operators (constructed from the Lie algebra generators) in the PNCS and show that it is minimized for the PCS. Finally, we obtain the time evolution of the PNCS and the algebra generators. We prove that the SUR gets its minimum at time equals zero and for the standard PCS. We emphasize that our treatment is strictly algebraic and does not depend on the explicit form of the PNCS, even we report these states.

This work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the Perelomov number coherent states (PNCS) for the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra. Applying the similarity transformations to the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra generators by means of the displacement operator, we construct three operators which act on PNCS. We show that these operators close the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra and that the basis for its unitary irreducible representation is given by the PNCS. We define two position and momentum-like operators for the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra and we prove that standard Perelomov coherent states are of minimum uncertainty, according to the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship. By supposing that the Hamiltonian is proportional to one of the generators of the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra, we obtain the time-dependence of some of the previous results. In section 3, we approach the points of Section 2 for the $su(2)$ Lie algebra PNCS. Finally, we give some concluding remarks.

2 $SU(1,1)$ Perelomov number coherent states

The $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra is spanned by the generators K_+, K_- and K_0, which satisfy the commutation relations [43]

$$[K_0, K_\pm] = \pm K\pm, \qquad [K_-, K_+] = 2K_0. \tag{1}$$

The action of these operators on the Fock space states $\{|k,n\rangle, n = 0,1,2,...\}$ is

$$K_+|k,n\rangle = \sqrt{(n+1)(2k+n)}|k,n+1\rangle, \tag{2}$$

$$K_-|k,n\rangle = \sqrt{n(2k+n-1)}|k,n-1\rangle, \tag{3}$$

$$K_0|k,n\rangle = (k+n)|k,n\rangle, \tag{4}$$

where $|k,0\rangle$ is the lowest normalized state. The Casimir operator $K^2 = K_\pm K_\mp - K_0(K_0 \mp 1)$ for any irreducible representation satisfies $K^2 = k(k-1)$. Thus, a representation of $su(1,1)$ algebra is determined by the number k. For the purpose of the present work we will restrict to the discrete series only, for which $k > 0$.

The standard Perelomov coherent states $|\zeta\rangle$ are defined as [19]

$$|\zeta\rangle = D(\xi)|k,0\rangle, \tag{5}$$

where $D(\xi) = \exp(\xi K_+ - \xi^* K_-)$ is the displacement operator and ξ is a complex number. From the properties $K_+^\dagger = K_-$ and $K_-^\dagger = K_+$ it can be shown that the displacement operator possesses the property

$$D^\dagger(\xi) = \exp(\xi^* K_- - \xi K_+) = D(-\xi), \tag{6}$$

and the so called normal form of the displacement operator is given by

$$D(\xi) = \exp(\zeta K_+)\exp(\eta K_0)\exp(-\zeta^* K_-), \tag{7}$$

where $\xi = -\frac{1}{2}\tau e^{-i\varphi}$, $\zeta = -\tanh(\frac{1}{2}\tau)e^{-i\varphi}$ and $\eta = -2\ln\cosh|\xi| = \ln(1-|\zeta|^2)$ [44]. By using this normal form of the displacement operator and equations (2)-(4), the Perelomov coherent states are found to be [19]

$$|\zeta\rangle = (1-|\zeta|^2)^k \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(n+2k)}{s!\Gamma(2k)}}\zeta^s |k,s\rangle. \tag{8}$$

The Perelomov number coherent states are defined as the action of the displacement operator $D(\xi)$ on any state $|k,n\rangle$, instead of the lowest state $|k,0\rangle$ of the Fock space. This is the obvious generalization of equation (5). Thus,

$$|\zeta,k,n\rangle = D(\xi)|k,n\rangle = \exp(\zeta K_+)\exp(\eta K_3)\exp(-\zeta^* K_-)|k,n\rangle \tag{9}$$

are what we call the $SU(1,1)$ Perelomov number coherent states (PNCS). The last equality is due to the normal form of the displacement operator of equation (7).

By using equations (2)-(4), we obtain the action of the three exponentials on an arbitrary state $|k,n\rangle$ of the Fock space

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-\zeta^* K_-)^m}{m!}|k,n\rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{n} \frac{(-\zeta^*)^m}{m!}\left(\frac{n!(2k+n-1)!}{(n-m)!(2k+n-1-m)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|k,n-m\rangle, \tag{10}$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta K_0)^m}{m!}|k,n\rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta(k+n))^m}{m!}|k,n\rangle, \tag{11}$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta K_+)^m}{m!}|k,n\rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta^m}{m!}\left(\frac{(n+m)!(2k+n)!}{n!(2k+n-m)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|k,n+m\rangle. \tag{12}$$

From these results we obtain the PNCS in the Fock space

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta,k,n\rangle &= \sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\frac{\zeta^s}{s!}\sum_{m=0}^{n}\frac{(-\zeta^*)^m}{m!}e^{\eta(k+n-m)}\sqrt{(n)_m(n-m)^{s+1}} \\ &\quad \times\sqrt{(2k+n-1)_m(2k+n-m)_s}|k,n-m+s\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where we used within the square root the Pochhammer's notation, $(a)_n \equiv a(a-1)...(a-n+1)$ and $(a)^n \equiv a(a+1)...(a+n-1)$. These states generalize the Perelomov coherent states (8), which are obtained by setting $n=0$.

2.1 $SU(1,1)$ ladder operators linking two consecutive PNCS

We look for the operators $L_\pm$ and L_0 which act on the PNCS as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_\pm|\zeta,k,n\rangle &= \lambda_\pm|\zeta,k,n\pm 1\rangle, && (14)\\
L_0|\zeta,k,n\rangle &= \lambda_0|\zeta,k,n\rangle. && (15)
\end{aligned}
$$

To achieve this we use the definition of the PNCS, equation (9), which allows to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_\pm D(\xi)|k,n\rangle &= \lambda_\pm D(\xi)|k,n\pm 1\rangle, && (16)\\
L_0 D(\xi)|k,n\rangle &= \lambda_0 D(\xi)|k,n\rangle, && (17)
\end{aligned}
$$

or

$$
\begin{aligned}
D^\dagger(\xi)L_\pm D(\xi)|k,n\rangle &= \lambda_\pm|k,n\pm 1\rangle, && (18)\\
D^\dagger(\xi)L_0 D(\xi)|k,n\rangle &= \lambda_0|k,n\rangle. && (19)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that the states on these equations are those of the unitary irreducible representation for the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra. Hence, by comparison of equations (18) and (19) with equations (2)-(4), and using the properties of the displacement operator $D(\xi)$, we obtain

$$L_\pm = D(\xi)K_\pm D^\dagger(\xi), \qquad L_0 = D(\xi)K_0 D^\dagger(\xi), \tag{20}$$

and the explicit form of $\lambda_\pm$ and λ_0 is given by

$$\lambda_+ = \sqrt{(n+1)(2k+n)}, \quad \lambda_- = \sqrt{n(2k+n-1)}, \quad \lambda_0 = k+n. \tag{21}$$

The substitution of these values into equations (14) and (15) allows to obtain the action of the operators $L_\pm$ and L_0 on the PNCS

$$L_+|\zeta,k,n\rangle = \sqrt{(n+1)(2k+n)}|\zeta,k,n+1\rangle, \tag{22}$$

$$L_-|\zeta,k,n\rangle = \sqrt{n(2k+n-1)}|\zeta,k,n-1\rangle, \tag{23}$$

$$L_0|\zeta,k,n\rangle = (k+n)|\zeta,k,n\rangle. \tag{24}$$

On the other hand, by performing the similarity transformation (20) on the $su(1,1)$ commutation relations (1), we conclude that the operators $L_\pm$ and L_0 also satisfy the $su(1,1)$ commutation relations

$$[L_0, L_\pm] = \pm L\pm, \qquad [L_-, L_+] = 2L_0. \tag{25}$$

Results above are very interesting since they show that $L_\pm$ and L_0 content the same algebraic structure that operators $K_\pm$ and K_0, being the PNCS the new basis to get the unitary irreducible representation for the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra.

The rest of this section if advocated to obtain explicit expressions of the $L_\pm$ and L_0 operators in terms of K_0 and $K_\pm$. By using the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff identity

$$e^{-A}Be^{A} = B + \frac{1}{1!}[B,A] + \frac{1}{2!}[[B,A],A] + \frac{1}{3!}[[[B,A],A],A] + ..., \tag{26}$$

and equations (3)-(5), we can find the similarity transformations $D^\dagger(\xi)K_+D(\xi)$, $D^\dagger(\xi)K_-D(\xi)$ and $D^\dagger(\xi)K_0D(\xi)$ of the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra generators. These results are given by

$$D^\dagger(\xi)K_+D(\xi) = \frac{\xi^*}{|\xi|}\alpha K_0 + \beta\left(K_+ + \frac{\xi^*}{\xi}K_-\right) + K_+, \tag{27}$$

$$D^\dagger(\xi)K_-D(\xi) = \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\alpha K_0 + \beta\left(K_- + \frac{\xi}{\xi^*}K_+\right) + K_-, \tag{28}$$

$$D^\dagger(\xi)K_0D(\xi) = (2\beta+1)K_0 + \frac{\alpha\xi}{2|\xi|}K_+ + \frac{\alpha\xi^*}{2|\xi|}K_-, \tag{29}$$

where $\alpha = \sinh(2|\xi|)$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{2}\left[\cosh(2|\xi|) - 1\right]$.

Since $D^\dagger(\xi) = D(-\xi)$, the explicit form of the operators $L_\pm$ is obtained from the similarity transformations (27) and (28) by replacing $\xi \to -\xi$, obtaining

$$L_+ = -\frac{\xi^*}{|\xi|}\alpha K_0 + \frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)\left(K_+ + \frac{\xi^*}{\xi}K_-\right) + K_+, \tag{30}$$

$$L_- = -\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\alpha K_0 + \frac{1}{2}(\beta-1)\left(K_- + \frac{\xi}{\xi^*}K_+\right) + K_-. \tag{31}$$

In a similar way the transformation of the operator K_0 leads to

$$L_0 = D(\xi)K_0D^\dagger(\xi) = (2\beta+1)K_0 - \frac{\alpha\xi}{2|\xi|}K_+ - \frac{\alpha\xi^*}{2|\xi|}K_-. \tag{32}$$

With these results we achieve our purpose.

2.2 Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship for the $SU(1,1)$ PNCS

From the $SU(1,1)$ group ladder operators K_+ and K_-, we define the X and Y operators as [45]

$$X \equiv K_+ + K_-, \qquad Y \equiv i(K_+ - K_-). \tag{33}$$

With these equations we can compute the quadratic deviations of the operators X and Y for the Perelomov number coherent states

$$(\Delta X)^2_n = \langle \zeta, k, n|X^2|\zeta, k, n\rangle - \langle \zeta, k, n|X|\zeta, k, n\rangle^2, \tag{34}$$

$$(\Delta Y)^2_n = \langle \zeta, k, n|Y^2|\zeta, k, n\rangle - \langle \zeta, k, n|Y|\zeta, k, n\rangle^2. \tag{35}$$

The definition of the Perelomov number coherent states (9) and the similarity transformations, equations (27) and (28), leads to obtain

$$\langle\zeta|X^2|\zeta\rangle_n = \alpha^2(k+n)^2\left(2+\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}+\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)+2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2+\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}+\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right], \tag{36}$$

$$\langle\zeta|X|\zeta\rangle_n = \frac{\alpha(k+n)}{|\xi|}(\xi^*+\xi), \tag{37}$$

and

$$\langle\zeta|Y^2|\zeta\rangle_n = \alpha^2(k+n)^2\left(2-\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}-\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)+2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2-\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}-\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right], \tag{38}$$

$$\langle\zeta|Y|\zeta\rangle_n = \frac{i\alpha(k+n)}{|\xi|}(\xi^*-\xi). \tag{39}$$

By substituting these results into equations (34) and (35), we obtain the quadratic deviations of the X and Y operators

$$(\Delta X)^2_n = 2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2+\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}+\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right], \tag{40}$$

and

$$(\Delta Y)^2_n = 2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2-\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}-\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right]. \tag{41}$$

Hence, the product of these quadratic deviations is

$$(\Delta X)^2_n(\Delta Y)^2_n = 4(n^2+2kn+k)^2\left\{(\beta^2+\beta)^2\left[4-\left(\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}+\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)^2\right]+4(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right\}. \tag{42}$$

The Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship states that the product of the quadratic deviations of any two operators X and Y satisfy [38]

$$(\Delta X)^2(\Delta Y)^2 \geq \langle F\rangle^2 + \frac{1}{4}\langle C\rangle^2, \tag{43}$$

where, $\langle C\rangle \equiv -i\langle[X,Y]\rangle$, and $\langle F\rangle \equiv \langle\frac{1}{2}\{X,Y\}+\langle X\rangle\langle Y\rangle\rangle$ is the quantum correlation of the operators X and Y.

If we use equation (9) and the similarity transformation method to calculate the expectation values $\langle F\rangle$ and $\langle C\rangle$ in a Perelomov number coherent state, we obtain

$$\langle\zeta,k,n|F|\zeta,k,n\rangle_n = 2i(n^2+2kn+k)(\beta^2+\beta)\left(\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}-\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right), \tag{44}$$

$$\langle\zeta,k,n|C|\zeta,k,n\rangle_n = 4(k+n)(2\beta+1). \tag{45}$$

By substituting the results of equations (42), (44) and (45) into equation (43), we conclude that the PNCS are not of minimum uncertainty, according to the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship. However, for the Perelomov coherent states ($n=0$) the equality in equation (43) holds. Therefore, the only states which minimize the Schrödinger uncertainty relationship are those obtained by applying the displacement operator $D(\xi)$ on the lowest normalized state. This result is in full agreement to that previously reported in reference [19].

2.3 Time evolution of the $SU(1,1)$ PNCS

The time evolution operator $U(t)$ for an arbitrary Hamiltonian H is defined as $U(t)=e^{-iHt/\hbar}$ [46]. If we suppose that the Hamiltonian is proportional to the group operator K_0, we can write the time evolution operator as

$$U(t) = e^{-i\gamma K_0 t/\hbar}. \tag{46}$$

With this definition, the BCH identity and equation (1), we can compute the time evolution of the $su(1,1)$ algebra ladder operators $K_\pm$ with the similarity transformations

$$K_+(t) = U^\dagger(t)K_+U(t) = K_+e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}, \tag{47}$$

$$K_-(t) = U^\dagger(t) K_- U(t) = K_- e^{-i\gamma t/\hbar}. \tag{48}$$

Notice that we can obtain the same results by using the Heisenberg equations. Thus, from equation (9), the time evolution of the PNCS $|\zeta(t), k, n\rangle$ is given by

$$|\zeta(t), k, n\rangle \equiv U(t)|\zeta, k, n\rangle = U(t) D(\xi) U^\dagger(t) U(t)|k, n\rangle. \tag{49}$$

From equation (4), the time evolution of the state $|k, n\rangle$ is given by

$$U(t)|k, n\rangle = e^{-i\gamma(k+n)t/\hbar}|k, n\rangle. \tag{50}$$

Hence, we must to calculate $U(t)D(\xi)U^\dagger(t)$. From equations (47) and (48) we find that

$$U(t) D(\xi) U^\dagger(t) = e^{\xi K_+(-t) - \xi^* K_-(-t)} = e^{\xi(-t) K_+ - \xi(-t)^* K_-}, \tag{51}$$

where we have introduced the time-dependent complex $\xi(t) = \xi e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}$. Thus, the time evolution of the displacement operator $D(\xi)$ is due to the time evolution of $\xi(t)$. The time evolution of the displacement operator in its normal form is given by

$$D\left(\xi(t)\right) = U^\dagger(t) D(\xi) U(t) = U^\dagger(t) e^{\zeta K_+} e^{\eta K_0} e^{-\zeta^* K_-} U(t). \tag{52}$$

By defining the time-dependent complex $\zeta(t) = \zeta e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}$, we obtain that the time-dependent normal form of the displacement operator $D(\xi)$ is

$$D\left(\xi(t)\right) = e^{\zeta(t) K_+} e^{\eta K_0} e^{-\zeta(t)^* K_-}. \tag{53}$$

With the previous results and equations (50) and (53), we obtain that the time-dependent PNCS are

$$|\zeta(t), k, n\rangle = e^{-i\gamma(k+n)t/\hbar} e^{\zeta(-t) K_+} e^{\eta K_0} e^{-\zeta(-t)^* K_-}|k, n\rangle. \tag{54}$$

Thus, the time evolution of the PNCS for the $su(1,1)$ algebra is obtained by adding the phase $e^{-i\gamma(k+n)t/\hbar}$ and substituting $\zeta \rightarrow \zeta(-t)$ and $\zeta^* \rightarrow \zeta(-t)^*$ into equation (13). The expression of equation (54) generalizes the Perelomov coherent states, which are recovered by setting $t = 0$ and $n = 0$. The results of this Section can be extended to the cases in which the Hamiltonian depends on a linear combination of the algebra generators, instead of just K_0.

2.4 Time-dependent Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship for the $SU(1,1)$ PNCS

The time evolution of the operators X and Y are given by the equations

$$X(t) = K_+(t) + K_-(t), \qquad Y(t) = i\left(K_+(t) - K_-(t)\right). \tag{55}$$

With these expressions we can compute the time-dependent quadratic deviations of the X and Y operators. By using equations (47) and (48), we obtain

$$(\Delta X(t))^2_n = 2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2+\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}e^{-2i\gamma t/\hbar}+\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}e^{2i\gamma t/\hbar}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right], \tag{56}$$

$$(\Delta Y(t))^2_n = 2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2-\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}e^{-2i\gamma t/\hbar}-\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}e^{2i\gamma t/\hbar}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right]. \tag{57}$$

We remark that these results can be obtained by substituting $\xi \to \xi(t)$ on the non time-dependent quadratic deviations of the PNCS. Thus,

$$(\Delta X(t))^2_n = 2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2+\frac{\xi^*(t)}{\xi(t)}+\frac{\xi(t)}{\xi^*(t)}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right], \tag{58}$$

$$(\Delta Y(t))^2_n = 2(n^2+2kn+k)\left[\left(2-\frac{\xi^*(t)}{\xi(t)}-\frac{\xi(t)}{\xi^*(t)}\right)(\beta^2+\beta)+1\right]. \tag{59}$$

These equations generalize the results of equations (40) and (41), which are obtained by setting $t=0$. Likewise, the time-dependent expectation values $\langle F\rangle$ and $\langle C\rangle$, evaluated in the PNCS, are

$$\langle F(t)\rangle_n = 2i(n^2+2kn+k)(\beta^2+\beta)\left(\frac{\xi(t)^*}{\xi(t)}-\frac{\xi(t)}{\xi(t)^*}\right), \tag{60}$$

$$\langle C(t)\rangle_n = 4(k+n)(2\beta+1). \tag{61}$$

By substituting these results into equation (43) we deduce that, when we take into account time, the only PNCS for the $su(1,1)$ algebra which minimize the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship are those for which $n=0$ and $t=0$, namely, the standard Perelomov coherent states.

3 $SU(2)$ Perelomov number coherent states

In what follows, the results for the $su(2)$ Lie algebra are obtained in a similar way to those for the $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra.

The $su(2)$ Lie algebra is spanned by the generators J_+, J_- and J_0, which satisfy the commutation relations [43]

$$[J_0, J_\pm] = \pm J\pm, \qquad [J_+, J_-] = 2J_0. \tag{62}$$

The action of these operators on the Fock space states $\{|j,\mu\rangle, -j \leq \mu \leq j\}$ is

$$J_+|j,\mu\rangle = \sqrt{(j-\mu)(j+\mu+1)}|j,\mu+1\rangle, \tag{63}$$

$$J_-|j,\mu\rangle = \sqrt{(j+\mu)(j-\mu+1)}|j,\mu-1\rangle, \tag{64}$$

$$J_0|j,\mu\rangle = \mu|j,\mu\rangle. \tag{65}$$

The displacement operator $D(\xi)$ is

$$D(\xi) = \exp(\xi J_+ - \xi^* J_-). \tag{66}$$

By means of Gaussian decomposition, the normal form of this operator is

$$D(\xi) = \exp(\zeta J_+)\exp(\eta J_0)\exp(-\zeta^* J_-), \tag{67}$$

where $\zeta = -\tan(\frac{1}{2}\theta)e^{-i\varphi}$ and $\eta = -2\ln\cos|\xi| = \ln(1+|\zeta|^2)$ [19].

The $SU(2)$ Perelomov coherent states, $|\zeta\rangle = D(\xi)|j,-j\rangle$ are given by [19]

$$|\zeta\rangle = \sum_{s=-j}^{j}\left[\frac{(2j)!}{(j+s)!(j-s)!}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}(1+|\zeta|^2)^{-j}\zeta^{j+s}|j,s\rangle. \tag{68}$$

In a similar way to the definition (9), the Perelomov number coherent states for the $su(2)$ algebra are defined as the action of the displacement operator $D(\xi)$ on any state $|j,\mu\rangle$, instead of the lower state $|j,-j\rangle$ of the Fock space. Thus,

$$|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle = D(\xi)|j,\mu\rangle = \exp(\zeta J_+)\exp(\eta J_0)\exp(-\zeta^* J_-)|j,\mu\rangle \tag{69}$$

where we have used the normal form of the displacement operator, equation (67).

The action of the three exponentials on an arbitrary state of the Fock space $|j,\mu\rangle$ ($\mu = -j, -j+1, ..., j-1, j$), is

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-\zeta^* J_-)^n}{n!}|j,\mu\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\mu+j} \frac{(-\zeta^*)^n}{n!}\left(\frac{(j+\mu)!(j-\mu+n)!}{(j+\mu-n)!(j-\mu)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|j,\mu-n\rangle, \quad (70)$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta J_0)^n}{n!}|j,\mu\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\eta\mu)^n}{n!}|j,\mu\rangle, \quad (71)$$

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\zeta J_+)^n}{n!}|j,\mu\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{j-\mu} \frac{\zeta^n}{n!}\left(\frac{(j+\mu+n)!(j-\mu)!}{(j+\mu)!(j-\mu-n)!}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}|j,\mu+n\rangle. \quad (72)$$

Therefore, the PNCS of the $su(2)$ algebra in the Fock space are given by

$$\begin{aligned}|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle &= \sum_{s=0}^{j-\mu+n}\frac{\zeta^s}{s!}\sum_{n=0}^{\mu+j}\frac{(-\zeta^*)^n}{n!}e^{\eta(\mu-n)}\sqrt{(j+\mu)_n(j-\mu)^{n+1}} \\ &\quad\times\sqrt{(j+\mu-n)^{s+1}(j-\mu+n)_s}|j,\mu-n+s\rangle, \quad (73)\end{aligned}$$

where we have used into the square root the Pochhammer's notation. The $SU(2)$ PCS of equation (68), are recovered by setting $\mu = -j$ in the last equation.

3.1 $SU(2)$ ladder operators linking two consecutive PNCS

From equations (63), (64), (65) and (69), we show that the operators which link the $SU(2)$ PNCS $|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle$ to $|\zeta,j,\mu\pm 1\rangle$ are

$$I_+|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle = \sqrt{(j-\mu)(j+\mu+1)}|\zeta,j,\mu+1\rangle, \quad (74)$$

$$I_-|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle = \sqrt{(j+\mu)(j-\mu+1)}|\zeta,j,\mu-1\rangle, \quad (75)$$

$$I_0|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle = \mu|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle \quad (76)$$

where, $I_\pm = D(\xi)J_\pm D^\dagger(\xi)$.

On the other hand, the similarity transformation on the operators J_0 and $J_\pm$

$$I_\pm = D(\xi)J_\pm D^\dagger(\xi), \qquad I_0 = D(\xi)J_0 D^\dagger(\xi), \quad (77)$$

leads to show that

$$[I_0, I_\pm] = \pm I_\pm, \qquad [I_+, I_-] = 2I_0. \quad (78)$$

Thus, the operators $I_\pm$ and I_0 satisfy the $su(2)$ Lie algebra. Also, from equations (74)-(76) we observe that unitary irreducible representations of the $su(2)$ generators, $I_\pm$ and I_0, are given by the PNCS.

The similarity transformation of the $su(2)$ Lie algebra generators are computed by using of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff identity and equations (62). They are

$$D^\dagger(\xi)J_+D(\xi) = -\frac{\xi^*}{|\xi|}\delta J_0 + \epsilon\left(J_+ + \frac{\xi^*}{\xi}J_-\right) + J_+, \tag{79}$$

$$D^\dagger(\xi)J_-D(\xi) = -\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\delta J_0 + \epsilon\left(J_- + \frac{\xi}{\xi^*}J_+\right) + J_-, \tag{80}$$

$$D^\dagger(\xi)J_0D(\xi) = (2\epsilon+1)J_0 + \frac{\delta\xi}{2|\xi|}J_+ + \frac{\delta\xi^*}{2|\xi|}J_-, \tag{81}$$

where $\delta = \sin(2|\xi|)$ and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}\left[\cos(2|\xi|) - 1\right]$.

From equations (79)-(81), and the property $D^\dagger(\xi) = D(-\xi)$, we obtain

$$I_+ = \frac{\xi^*}{|\xi|}\delta J_0 + \epsilon\left(J_+ + \frac{\xi^*}{\xi}J_-\right) + J_+, \tag{82}$$

$$I_- = \frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\delta J_0 + \epsilon\left(J_- + \frac{\xi}{\xi^*}J_+\right) + J_-, \tag{83}$$

$$I_0 = (2\epsilon+1)J_0 - \frac{\delta\xi}{2|\xi|}J_+ - \frac{\delta\xi^*}{2|\xi|}J_-. \tag{84}$$

These equations are the explicit form of the operators $I_\pm$ and I_0 in terms of $J_\pm$ and J_0.

3.2 Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship for the $SU(2)$ PNCS

The X and Y operators for the $su(2)$ algebra ladder operators are defined as [45]

$$X \equiv J_+ + J_-, \qquad Y \equiv i(J_+ - J_-). \tag{85}$$

The quadratic deviations product for the X and Y operators in the $SU(2)$ Perelomov number coherent states is

$$(\Delta X)^2_n(\Delta Y)^2_n = 4(j+j^2-\mu^2)^2\left\{(\epsilon^2+\epsilon)^2\left[4-\left(\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}+\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right)^2\right] + 4(\epsilon^2+\epsilon)+1\right\}. \tag{86}$$

If we use equation (69) and the similarity transformation method, the expectation values $\langle F\rangle$ and $\langle C\rangle$ in a $SU(2)$ PNCS are given by

$$\langle\zeta,j,\mu|F|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle_n = 2i(j+j^2-\mu^2)(\epsilon^2+\epsilon)\left(\frac{\xi^*}{\xi}-\frac{\xi}{\xi^*}\right), \tag{87}$$

$$\langle\zeta,j,\mu|C|\zeta,j,\mu\rangle_n = -4\mu(2\epsilon+1). \tag{88}$$

By substituting the results of equations (86), (87) and (88) into equation (43) we conclude, again, that the $SU(2)$ PNCS are not of minimum uncertainty, according to the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship. Moreover, likewise the $SU(1,1)$ PCS, the $SU(2)$ PCS satisfy the equality in equation (43). Therefore, the only states which minimize the Schrödinger uncertainty relationship are those obtained by applying the displacement operator $D(\xi)$ on the lowest normalized state.

3.3 Time evolution of the $SU(2)$ PNCS

As for the case of the $su(1,1)$ algebra, we will suppose that the Hamiltonian is proportional to the group generator J_0. Hence

$$U(t) = e^{-i\gamma J_0 t/\hbar}. \tag{89}$$

This implies that the time evolution of the $su(2)$ algebra ladder operators $J_\pm$ are

$$J_+ = U^\dagger(t)J_+U(t) = J_+e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}, \tag{90}$$

$$J_- = U^\dagger(t)J_-U(t) = J_-e^{-i\gamma t/\hbar}. \tag{91}$$

Thus, by using equation (69), the time evolution of the $SU(2)$ PNCS $|\zeta(t),j,\mu\rangle$ are given by

$$|\zeta(t),j,\mu\rangle = U(t)|\zeta\rangle = U(t)D(\xi)U^\dagger(t)U(t)|j,\mu\rangle. \tag{92}$$

From equation (65), (90) and (91), and the definitions $\xi(t)\equiv\xi e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}$ and $\zeta(t)=\zeta e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}$, we can show that the time-dependent $SU(2)$ PNCS are given by

$$|\zeta(t),j,\mu\rangle = e^{-i\gamma\mu t/\hbar}e^{\zeta(-t)J_+}e^{\eta J_0}e^{-\zeta(-t)^*J_-}|\zeta,k,n\rangle. \tag{93}$$

Therefore, the time evolution of these states is obtained by adding the phase $e^{-i\gamma\mu t/\hbar}$ and substituting $\zeta\to\zeta(-t)$ and $\zeta^*\to\zeta(-t)^*$ into equation (73). Equation (93) generalizes the $SU(2)$ Perelomov coherent states, which are recovered by setting $t=0$ and $\mu=-j$.

3.4 Time-dependent Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship for the $SU(2)$ PNCS

The time evolution of the $su(2)$ operators X and Y are given by

$$X(t) = J_+(t) + J_-(t), \qquad Y(t) = i\left(J_+(t) - J_-(t)\right). \tag{94}$$

With these equations we obtain the quadratic deviations of the $SU(2)$ PNCS

$$(\Delta X(t))^2_n = 2(j + j^2 - \mu^2)\left[\left(2 + \frac{\xi^*(t)}{\xi(t)} + \frac{\xi(t)}{\xi^*(t)}\right)(\beta^2 + \beta) + 1\right], \tag{95}$$

$$(\Delta Y(t))^2_n = 2(j + j^2 - \mu^2)\left[\left(2 - \frac{\xi^*(t)}{\xi(t)} - \frac{\xi(t)}{\xi^*(t)}\right)(\beta^2 + \beta) + 1\right], \tag{96}$$

where we have substituted the time-dependent complex $\xi(t) = \xi e^{i\gamma t/\hbar}$. The expectation values $\langle F(t)\rangle$ and $\langle C(t)\rangle$ evaluated in the PNCS for the $su(2)$ algebra are

$$\langle F(t)\rangle_n = 2i(j + j^2 - \mu^2)(\epsilon^2 + \epsilon)\left(\frac{\xi(t)^*}{\xi(t)} - \frac{\xi(t)}{\xi(t)^*}\right), \tag{97}$$

$$\langle C(t)\rangle_n = -4\mu(2\epsilon + 1). \tag{98}$$

Therefore, with these results and equation (43), we prove that the standard PCS for the $su(2)$ algebra are the only states which minimize the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship, even if we take into account time.

4 Concluding remarks

We have constructed the Perelomov number coherent states and the time-dependent Perelomov number coherent states for the $su(1,1)$ and $su(2)$ Lie algebras. Based on the similarity transformation method, we built a set of ladder operators that close the respective Lie algebra and proved that the PNCS are the basis for its unitary irreducible representation. We introduced the position and momentum-like operators and showed that the Schrödinger's uncertainty relationship is minimized only for the standard Perelomov coherent states, even we considered their time evolution. We emphasize that all of our results are the most general, since they do not depend on the particular realization of the Lie algebra generators. Thus, with our procedure we can construct the PNCS for any problem which accept to be treated for the $su(2)$ or $su(1,1)$ Lie algebra, as for example, to those we mentioned in the Introduction of this paper. Some other problems for which it is immediate to obtain the PNCS with our treatment are the Gendeshtein and Morse potentials [47], the Mie type-potential [48], the particle moving on a cone and bound to its tip by 1/r or harmonic oscillator potentials [49], the relativistic hydrogen atom [50, 51] and to the many $su(1,1)$ solvable potentials important in atomic and molecular physics [52].

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by SNI-México, COFAA-IPN, EDI-IPN, SIP-IPN project number 20120720.

References

[1] E. Schrödinger, Naturwiss. 14, 664 (1926).

[2] R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. 130, 2529 (1963).

[3] J. R. Klauder, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 11, 123 (1960); J. Math. Phys. 4, 1055 (1963).

[4] E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 227 (1963).

[5] M. M. Nieto, quant-ph/9708012v1 (1997).

[6] M. Boiteux and A. Levelut, J. Phys. A 6, 589 (1973).

[7] S. M. Roy and V. Singh, Phys. Rev. D 25, 3413 (1982).

[8] M. V. Satyanarayana, Phys. Rev. D 32, 400 (1985).

[9] M. S. Kim, F. A. M. de Oliveira, P. L. Knight, and V. Bužek, Phys. Rev. A 41, 2645 (1990).

[10] M. M. Nieto, Phys. Lett. A 229, 135 (1997).

[11] A. O. Barut and L. Girardello, Commun. Math. Phys. 21, 41 (1971).

[12] A. M. Perelomov, Commun. Math. Phys. 26, 222 (1972).

[13] J. P. Gazeau, Coherent States in Quantum Physics. Wiley-VCH, Germany, 2009.

[14] A. B. Klimov and S. M. Chumakov, A Group-Theoretical Approach to Quantum Optics. Wiley-VCH, Germany, 2009.

[15] K. Wodkiewicz and J. H. Eberly, J. Opt. Soc. Am. 2, 458 (1985).

[16] C. Brif, A. Vourdas and A. Mann., J. Phys. A 29, 5873 (1996).

[17] C. Brif, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 36, 1651 (1997).

[18] J. R. Klauder and B. S. Skagerstam, Coherent States-Applications in Physics and Mathematical Physics. World Scientific, Singapore, 1985.

[19] A. M. Perelomov, Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

[20] W. M. Zhang, D.H. Feng and R. Gilmore, Rev. Mod. Phys. 62, 867 (1990).

[21] C. C. Gerry, Phys. Rev. A 33, 6 (1986).

[22] J. R. Klauder, J. Phys. A 29, L293 (1996).

[23] P. Majumdar and H. S. Sharatchandra, Phys. Rev. A 56, R3322 (1997).

[24] T. Toyoda and S. Wakayama, Phys. Rev. A 59, 1021 (1999).

[25] T. Toyoda and S. Wakayama, Phys. Rev. A 64, 032110-1 (2001).

[26] Y. Gur and A. Mann, Phys. At. Nucl. 68, 1700 (2005).

[27] M. M. Nieto and L. M. Simmons, Phys. Rev. A 19, 438 (1979).

[28] T. Toyoda and S. Wakayama, J. Phys. A 25, 1671 (1992).

[29] S. H. Dong, Can. J. Phys. 80, 129 (2002).

[30] M. G. A. Crawford and E. R. Vrscay, Phys. Rev. A 57, 106 (1998).

[31] J.-P. Antoine, J.-P. Gazeau, P. Monceau, J. R. Klauder, and K. A. Penson, J. Math. Phys. 42, 2349 (2001).

[32] U. Roy, J. Banerji and P. K. Panigrahi, J. Phys. A 38, 9115 (2005).

[33] D. Popov, J. Phys. A 34, 5283 (2001).

[34] A. Feldman and A. H. Kahn, Phys. Rev. B 1, 4584 (1969).

[35] G. Loyola, M. Moshinsky and A. Szczepaniak, Am. J. Phys. 57, 811 (1989).

[36] C. F. Lo and K. L. Liu, Phys. Rev. A 48, 3362 (1993).

[37] H. Fakhri, Phys. Lett. A 313, 243 (2003).

[38] E. Schrödinger, Ber. Kyl. Acad. Wiss. Berlin, s. 296 (1930).

[39] H. Robertson, Phys. Rev. 35, 667 (1930).

[40] D. A. Trifonov, Eur. Phys. J. B29, 349 (2002).

[41] D. A. Trifonov, J. Math. Phys. 34, 100 (1992); D. A. Trifonov, J. Math. Phys. 35, 2297 (1994); D. A. Trifonov, J. Phys. A 30, 5491 (1997).

[42] C. Aragone, E. Chalbaud and S. Salamo, J. Math. Phys. 17, 1963 (1976).

[43] A. Vourdas, Phys. Rev. A 41, 1653 (1990).

[44] C. C. Gerry, Phys. Rev. A 31, 2721 (1985).

[45] Q. H. Liu and H. Zhuo, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 21, 2635 (2006).

[46] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu and F. Laloe, Quantum Mechanics. Berlin, Wiley-VCH, 1977.

[47] M. J. Englefield and C. Quesne, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 24, 3557 (1991).

[48] D. Martínez, J. C. Flores-Urbina, R. D. Mota and V. D. Granados, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 43, 135201 (2010).

[49] M. H. Al-Hashimi and U.-J. Wiese, Ann. Phys. 323, 82 (2008).

[50] Gh. E. Drăgănescu, A. Messina and A. Napoli, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. 4, 240 (2002).

[51] M. Salazar-Ramírez, D. Martínez, R. D. Mota and V. D. Granados, Phys. A: Math. Theor. 43, 445203 (2010).

[52] G. Levay, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 27, 3809 (1994).